GOVERNMENT

OF

THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

+ + + + + +
ZONING COMMISSION
+ + + + +
PUBLIC HEARING

THURSDAY,

MAY 5, 2005

## 

5
IN THE MATTER OF: 5
GEORGETOWN UNIVERSITY 5

5 Case No. 05-06

CyberKnife Addition to 5
Georgetown Hospital 5
5

Thursday
May 5, 2005

The Public Hearing of Case No. 05-06 convened in Room 220 South, 441 4th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20001, pursuant to notice at 6:30 p.m., Carol J. Mitten, Chairperson, presiding.

## ZONING COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT:

CAROL J. MITTEN Chairperson KEVIN HILDEBRAND Commissioner

JOHN PARSONS Commissioner (NPS)

OFFICE OF ZONING STAFF PRESENT:

SHARON SCHELLIN Zoning Specialist

OFFICE OF PLANNING STAFF PRESENT:

STEPHEN MORDFIN JENNIFER STEINGASSER

This transcript constitutes the minutes from the Public Hearing held on May 5, 2005

AG	ENDA	IT	EM						ΡĀ	AGE
CALL TO ORDER: Carol J. Mitten					•				•	.3
PRELIMINARY MATTERS Sharon Schellin				•	•				•	.5
VOTE TO DENY CITIZENS AGEORGETOWN PARTY STATUS										.6
GEORGE WASHINGTON HOSPI Ashleigh Horne						• •				
OFFICE OF PLANNING REPORTS Stephen Mordfin					•				•	16
PERSONS OR ORGANIZATION APPLICATION Ms. Zartman	S IN	OP	POSI	ITI	ON	Т(	T	'HE	•	20
CLOSING STATEMENT Ashleigh Horne					•				•	26
ADJOURN:										28

## P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S

6:34 p.m.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. This is a public hearing of the Zoning Commission of the District of Columbia for Thursday, May 5th, 2005. My name is Carol Mitten and joining me this evening are Commissioners John Parsons and Kevin Hildebrand.

The subject of this evening's hearing is Zoning Commission Case No. 05-06. This is a request by the Georgetown University for special exception relief pursuant to Sections 210 and 3104.1 of the zoning regulations for approval to permit construction of an addition to the Bles Building, I hope I said that right, to add a type of radiation treatment known as the CyberKnife.

The subject property is located at 3800 Reservoir Road, N.W., and is known as Lot 817 in Square 1321.

Notice of today's hearing was published in the D.C. Register on March 4th, 2005 and copies of the hearing announcement are available to you and are located in the wall bin near the door.

This hearing will be conducted in accordance with the provisions of 11 DCMR Section 3117

2

9

10 11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24

25

and the order of procedure will be as follows.

First, we'll take up an preliminary matters and then we'll have the presentation of the Applicant's case, report by the Office of Planning, report by any other Government agencies, report by the Advisory Neighborhood Commission; in this case it's 2-E, parties and persons in support and parties and persons in opposition.

The following time constraints will be maintained in this hearing. The Applicant will have 30 minutes for their presentation. Organizations will have five minutes. Individuals will have three minutes. The Commission intends to adhere to these time limits as strictly as possible in order to hear the case in a reasonable period of time. Commission reserves the right to change the time limits for presentations if necessary and notes that no time shall be ceded.

All persons appearing before the Commission are to fill out two witness cards. cards are also on the table near the door. Upon coming forward to speak to the Commission, please give both cards to the reporter who's sitting to our right.

Please be advised that this proceeding is being recorded by the court reporter and is also being

webcast live. Accordingly, we must ask you to refrain from any disruptive noises or actions in the hearing room. When presenting information to the Commission, please turn on and speak into the microphone, first stating your name and home address. When you are finished speaking, please turn the microphone off so that the microphone is no longer picking up sound or background noise.

The decision of the Commission in this case must be based exclusively on the public record. To avoid any appearance to the contrary, the Commission requests that persons present not engage the members of the Commission in conversation during a recess or at any other time and Mrs. Schellin will be available throughout the hearing to answer any procedural questions you might have.

I'd ask everyone to turn off all beepers and cell phones at this time so as not to disrupt the hearing.

And now we will take up any preliminary matters. Mrs. Schellin?

MS. SCHELLIN: Yes, ma'am. We have two. The first one is to let you know that we have received the Affidavit of Maintenance from the Applicant. And the second one, we have one request for party status

1	from Citizens of Georgetown.
2	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you. We have
3	a submission from the Citizens Association of
4	Georgetown. It was clocked in on the 3rd, which does
5	not meet the filing requirement and they have asked us
6	to waive the rule regarding the timing of the request
7	and I think there's an issue about the timing, but
8	there's also an issue about the fact that the
9	application does not even address the issues that one
10	is intended to address in the party status request.
11	So, I would move that we deny the request
12	from the Citizens Association of Georgetown in this
13	case.
14	COMMISSIONER PARSONS: I would second
15	that, Madam Chairman.
16	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: All right. Is there
17	any discussion?
18	(No audible response.)
19	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: All those in favor,
20	please say "aye." Aye.
21	COMMISSIONER PARSONS: Aye.
22	COMMISSIONER HILDEBRAND: Aye.
23	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: None opposed, Mrs.
24	Schellin.
25	MRS. SCHELLIN: Staff would record the

1	vote 3 to 0 to 2 to deny party status to the Citizens
2	Association of Georgetown. Commissioner Mitten
3	moving, Commissioner Parsons seconding, Commissioner
4	Hildebrand in favor, Commissioners Hood and Jeffries
5	not present, not voting.
6	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you. Now I'd
7	ask all those who plan to testify this evening to rise
8	now to take the oath and Mrs. Schellin will administer
9	the oath.
10	(The witnesses were sworn.)
11	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you. Whenever
12	you're ready and whoever's going to go first.
13	MS. HORNE: Good evening, members of the
14	Commission. My name is Ashleigh Horne. I'm with the
15	law firm of Pillsbury, Winthrop, Shaw, Pittman located
16	at 2300 N Street, N.W. here in Washington, D.C. and I
17	represent Georgetown University Hospital, the
18	Applicant in this case.
19	Before we get started, I would like to
20	submit Paul Torp as an expert in architecture and I
21	have his résumé here.
22	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Is there any
23	objection to accepting Mr. Torp as an expert in
24	architecture?
25	COMMISSIONER HILDEBRAND: Madam Chair, I

have no objection.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: All right. Thank you.

MS. HORNE: The hospital is here tonight pursuant to Section 210 of the zoning regulations to request approval to construct a 1,200 square foot addition to the first floor of the hospital's Bles Building. This addition will be used to house radiosurgery equipment known as a CyberKnife which provides a revolutionary type of radiation treatment for cancer.

The hospital currently has one CyberKnife facility, which is only one of three on the East Coast and six in the country. Demand for this treatment is increasing and has resulted in a need for the hospital to add an additional CyberKnife facility.

As you're aware, Georgetown's 2000 campus plan, as initially approved by the BZA has been vacated and remanded by the Court of Appeals in December of 2003. Because the order was vacated, none of the conditions that were contained in the prior order are in effect at this time. Even those that were not specifically addressed by the court.

The BZA decided not to hold further public hearings on the remand, but the Board asked the

Ö

,

parties to submit written materials which were submitted on August 2nd of last year. The BZA approved the campus plan during its public meeting of April 5th, 2005.

We do understand that the BZA order needs to be issued before the Commission can issue an order on this case. We had hoped that the order would be issued before today, but unfortunately has not. But at this time we do have a campus plan which was approved by the BZA on April 5th.

The Bles Building has been designated for medical center use in the campus plan and that has not changed. This addition will not change the approved use under the campus plan. It's a very minor addition of only 1,200 square feet and it will provide a much needed benefit for the District, and it will have little or no impact on the community. This addition will not affect the traffic or number of students, it will not create noise or other objectionable conditions and there will be no additional staff.

The Citizens Association of Georgetown has brought up some issues in its May 2nd filing, but they all relate to the campus plan as considered on remand by the BZA and they are those conditions that they would liked to see in the BZA order on April 5th, but

1 which the BZA did not include. We feel the appropriate venue for addressing those concerns would 2 be the BZA in the remand case and not in this venue. Their concerns, none of them relate to the CyberKnife addition. They don't relate to its use or its impact that it might have on the community. 6 And now we would like to proceed with the 8 testimony. First we have Regina Woods who's here on 9 10 behalf of the hospital. And we also have available 11 Paul Torp from Architection. He's the architect for 12 the addition and he available to answer any questions 13 that you might have about the addition. 14 Regina? 15 MS. WOODS: Good evening. I am Regina Knox Woods, Vice-president for Government Affairs at 16 Georgetown University Hospital which is located at 17 18 3800 Reservoir Road, N.W. 19 I am here today to request special 20 exception approval for the further processing of an 21 approved campus development plan for the construction of a modest addition to the first floor of the Bles 22 23 Building of the hospital. 24 You did pronounce it correctly. 25 The proposed addition will house a

revolutionary and potentially life saving treatment system known as a CyberKnife which provides life saving treatment for cancer of the liver, pancreas, lung, prostate and other cancers. Without this treatment, many tumors would be inoperable.

Unfortunately, we currently have a waiting list of patients who are seeking treatment for their disorders. In order to treat these patients in a timely manner, thereby alleviating their pain and suffering, we need this CyberKnife facility to be operational by the end of this year.

We have been informed that if the construction begins in June 2005 the project will be completed by the end of this year. As you are aware, we cannot file for permits without this approval and without an approval for permits, we cannot go before the Commission for Fine Arts for final approval. We are therefore requesting a decision from you this evening, as well as an expedited order.

Let me now tell you a bit about what the CyberKnife does and how it works.

This innovative technology delivers

concentrated and accurate beams of radiation to

intracranial and extra-cranial targets, many of which

are inoperable non-evasively. The robotic arm

attached to a miniature linear accelerator delivers concentrated beams of radiation to the targeted tumor from multiple positions and angles. This robotic arm is highly flexible allowing access to tumors in difficult to reach locations for patients with such conditions as spine cancer and spinal cord tumors, malignant tumors, benign tumors, arterial, venous malformations and other functional disorders. Because the treatment is non-invasive, it is painless, has significantly fewer complications than traditional open surgery, can often achieve comparable or better results and has no recovery period following treatment, all of which are clear benefits for the patient.

Georgetown University Hospital is proud to have been the first hospital in the United States and the only one in the Metropolitan Washington area, one of three on the East Coast, to offer the CyberKnife treatment to patients. At this time, the hospital has one CyberKnife facility in operation. Because of its success, there is great demand for its use and patients must endure an increasing waiting period for treatment. So that we may accommodate the increasing numbers of patients who are urgently seeking treatment, the hospital is requesting this special

٥.

exception to add a second CyberKnife facility for treatment of these patients reducing their waiting period and getting them the care they need as quickly as possible.

In December 2004, we received approval from the State Health Planning and Development Agency to purchase the robotic system. We subsequently received concept approval from the Fine Arts

Commission and enthusiastic approval from the

Georgetown community at its March ANC 2-E meeting for construction of the facility that will house the

CyberKnife and vault. We are also pleased to have the complete support of the university for this project.

The construction is necessary because the equipment is too heavy to be supported by the existing structure of the building and the building does not currently provide enough interior space to accommodate the equipment, nor allow for the high does of radiation it will generate. We propose to build a modest 1,200 square foot addition to the Bles Building that will extend no farther than the pedestrian foot path currently in place.

The proposed addition is very minor. It involves the renovation of approximately 2,400 square feet interior to the hospital and the addition of only

approximately 1,200 square feet. This small addition will have no adverse effect on surrounding properties. It will not cause objectionable impacts because of noise, traffic, number of students or other objectionable conditions. The hospital provides parking on site and the CyberKnife addition will not generate a need for additional parking. No additional staff will be required for this expansion.

Georgetown is not proposing any changes to existing campus uses or the campus boundaries. The addition will not cause an increase in student enrollment nor the hiring of new staff.

The addition is within the zoning parameters for the campus. The overall floor-area ratio for the university is 1.13, which is well below the 1.8 floor-area ratio permitted under the zoning regulations. Again, the addition will add only 1,200 square feet to the campus. This will have a negligible effect on the overall floor-area ratio for the campus.

As previously stated, the Commission of Fine Arts reviewed the proposed addition in November and had no objection to the concept design. We would like to have a final permit review, as I previously stated at the Commission of Fine Arts May meeting.

1	Their review in May will allow us to complete
2	construction by the end of the year so that patients
3	on that waiting list will have access to treatment.
4	Again, please bear in mind that the construction
5	process alone could take up to six months and again
6	that means we are seeking your approval by May 15th,
7	2005 in order to be able to submit permit documents in
8	a timely manner.
9	Thank you for your time this evening.
10	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you. Do you
11	want to go ahead with Mr. Torp and we'll ask questions
12	at the end?
13	MS. HORNE: We were just going to have him
14	available for questions.
15	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay.
16	MS. HORNE: If you had any questions about
17	the facility itself.
18	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. Is that it
19	then for your presentation?
20	MS. HORNE: Yes, that's it.
21	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. That's what we
22	like to hear.
23	All right. Any questions from the
24	Commission? Any questions?
25	(No audible response.)

1 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Is there anyone here from ANC 2-E? 2 3 (No audible response.) CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. Thank you very much. Now we'll turn to Mr. Mordfin for the Office of Planning report. 6 MR. MORDFIN: Good evening, Chair and members of the Commission. I'm Stephen Mordfin with 8 9 the Office of Planning. And the subject application is in conformance with the provisions of Section 210 10 11 of the zoning regulations because the proposed use is 12 for a university hospital in our resident district. 13 The proposed addition is to house mechanical equipment 14 only and is not likely to become objectionable to 15 neighboring property. The proposed addition will have only a minor effect on the existing 1.13 FAR, less 16 than the maximum 1.8 permitted. The proposed addition 17 18 is to house a medical and health care facility 19 consistent with the campus plan. No interim use of 20 off-campus land is proposed. No major new buildings 21 are proposed to be moved off campus and the subject 22 application is consistent with the policies of the 23 Comprehensive Plan. 24 The 2000-2010 Georgetown University campus 25 plan was approved by the BZA on April 5th, 2005,

1 however, the final campus plan order on listed conditions has not yet been published. Therefore, 2 although the Office of Planning has no issues with the application, OP cannot make a final recommendation pending the publication of those conditions. And that concludes the Office of Planning's presentation. CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you. I take your point about the fact that the order hasn't been 9 written, but was someone from the Office of Planning 10 11 present at the BZA vote and are you aware of at least 12 what conditions are likely to be in the order? 13 MR. MORDFIN: I am aware generally of what 14 -- I watched it, I have a copy of the transcript, but 15 until they've actually finalized it, that was the reason for the caution in the report. I didn't see 16 anything in there was going to preclude this building 17 18 addition from being permitted. 19 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. So based on 20 your understanding of where the BZA is at and given 21 that it's not final until the order is written, the 22 Office of Planning doesn't have any issues? MR. MORDFIN: That is correct. There are 23 24 no issues. 25 Okay. Okay. CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank

1 you. Does anyone have questions for Mr. 2 3 Mordfin? Any questions, Ms. Horne? Any questions? COMMISSIONER HILDEBRAND: Madam Chair, could I ask the Applicant to indulge me just one moment for a question? It deals with the 6 architecture. I notice on your plans you haven't identified the building materials of the exterior 9 10 facade. Could you speak just briefly about what 11 you're proposing? 12 MR. TORP: Do I need to state my name 13 again? 14 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: It wouldn't hurt. 15 MR. TORP: I'm Paul Torp, architect with Architection. Building materials which were presented 16 preliminarily to the Old Georgetown Board are a 17 18 combination of brick veneer and cast in place 19 architectural concrete that matches the Bles Building. There is also on the first floor facing the interior 20 21 of the hospital a section of mechanical louvers 22 because there will be mechanical systems below the vault itself. 23 24 COMMISSIONER HILDEBRAND: So you will be 25 matching the existing materials to the Bles Building?

1	MR. TORP: Yes.
2	COMMISSIONER HILDEBRAND: Thank you. That
3	was my only question.
4	MR. TORP: Okay.
5	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you. I don't
6	know that we have any other formal reports of other
7	Government agencies and I know that comments were
8	solicited from other agencies and they had none. And
9	again, I'll just ask is there anyone here from ANC
10	2-E?
11	(No audible response.)
12	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. We have their
13	report in the record indicating their support and it
14	meets the requirement for great weight. It is Exhibit
15	mine doesn't have an exhibit number on it. So
16	anyway, it's in the record.
17	I'd ask anyone who would like to testify
18	in support to come forward now.
19	(No audible response.)
20	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: All right. Then
21	anyone who would like to testify in opposition?
22	Would you give those cards to the reporter
23	before you start? Sorry.
24	And I'll just say that while we've been
25	advised it's the legal position of the Applicant and

we've been advised by Office of the Attorney General that the old order is not in effect, I'm going to give you latitude to spend your five minutes as you see fit, Mrs. Zartman.

MS. ZARTMAN: Thank you kindly.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Would you turn on your microphone for us?

MS. ZARTMAN: The Citizens Association of Georgetown is troubled by the interest as where we sit now in which you're being asked to review a second stage application without a structure of a campus plan.

We had sought to clarify the procedures that would govern this evening's discussion with an understanding that we have no objection to the CyberKnife facility itself. We are concerned that the traditional protection in second stage review, a series of conditions in a campus plan order for which the Applicant has to demonstrate substantial compliance are absent in this. We believe that creates a nullity in the campus plan regulatory structure. We are deeply troubled by that. We would have thought the rational position would have been to take the conditions objected to neither by the Court of Appeals nor by the Applicant, Georgetown

University, and use those as measures to evaluate this proposal. Rather, we appear to be bowing to a not yet final order from the Board of Zoning Adjustment that basically guts the campus plan regulatory structure. It offers absolutely no protection to the community. It offers the university total freedom to establish its own level of enrollment. It eliminates the concerns this Commission established in its last second stage review of the Performing Arts Center, rejecting the concept of averaging and asking for real numbers.

The Board of Zoning Adjustment chose to establish a different scheme, a different regimen for reviewing campus plans, eliminating all conditions that otherwise are covered by District law or regulation and including the barest, I mean, Daniel Glass elements of conditions in a campus plan order. We believe this puts the community at tremendous disadvantage.

We cannot measure in any way compliance. This evening's procedure doesn't require the filing of the documents that previously were required in second stage reviews, numbers of students, the formal by which you came to that compliance with a variety of standards that used to be part of the campus plan

order and those have been struck by the BZA. We had hoped that the Zoning Commission would have wished to establish at least affirmation of the standard it itself established in earlier campus plan review, second stage reviews. I cannot tell you the consequences of the position taken by the BZA. That process will unfold on its own.

I am sorry that tonight we are not reviewing this very worthy application in terms of the standard campus plan regimen. Has the university complied with the agreed upon standards of the campus plan order, as I say, including those not challenged by the court, not challenged by the university itself? We are here dealing with a campus plan order that has nothing more in it than, "Gee, that enrollment number makes sense to the university. It's good enough for us. The formulation by which they arrived at the number seems to satisfy them. It's good enough for us."

None of the members of the Board of Zoning
Adjustment participated in the review of the campus
plan or obviously any of the secondary approvals.
They read a record that apparently didn't reach them
in any important way. There was humor around the
issue of a condition dealing with helicopter flights.

1 You may recall that one of the issues when MedStar bought the Georgetown Hospital was the concern that 2 3 they would be transferring their shock trauma patients from Washington Hospital Center to Reservoir Road. There was a concern that there would be a desire to use that helicopter facility for other kinds of 6 transportation. In fact, the hospital has reported to us they had been requested during the inaugural to use 8 9 that helipad for transfer of VIPs to Georgetown. That was not an unreasonable element to 10 11 ask the hospital to report on the frequency with which 12 the facility was used. The BZA not only laughed at 13 that, but one of the BZA members said, "I want to 14 hammer this condition out of the order." No 15 comprehension, no understanding. 16 The Performing Arts Center. The community 17 sought a standard that would say, "You can't hold rock 18 concerts" --19 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: You need to close it 20 out now. 21 MS. ZARTMAN: Our hope is that there is 22 some way in which you will wish to intervene either by 23 a sua sponte review in order to protect the standards 24 you yourselves have established, the origination of a 25 emergency rule making case that will protect not us,

1	but the overall community from literally no standards
2	for campus plan review. There has to be something
3	beyond what we are now looking at.
4	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you. Any
5	questions for Mrs. Zartman?
6	MS. ZARTMAN: Oh, I wish to submit, one of
7	the issues was the campus plan included this standard
8	of student conduct and the fact that it existed was
9	part of the submission demonstrated the university was
10	fixing the problems in the community. I'd like to put
11	in the record, these are communications with the
12	Citizens Association of West Georgetowners, just West
13	Georgetown, difficulties with students that have not
14	at all been alleviated by a student code of conduct or
15	the Alliance for Local Living, or
16	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay.
17	MS. ZARTMAN: other acronyms that
18	exist.
19	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: You're free to submit
20	that to the record. Thank you.
21	Any questions for Mrs. Zartman?
22	COMMISSIONER PARSONS: No questions.
23	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Any questions?
24	COMMISSIONER HILDEBRAND: Are you aware
25	that all the conditions from the campus plan have been

1 struck? Is that your statement? MS. ZARTMAN: I can tell you which have 2 been struck. COMMISSIONER HILDEBRAND: Well, I don't need to know specifically. You made a statement that all of the conditions had been struck. Is that true? 6 That there are no conditions associated with the campus plan? 9 MS. ZARTMAN: There are some conditions. 10 The date of the campus plan is retained. The BZA took 11 the position that anything that is covered by other 12 District law should not have to be conditioned in the 13 campus plan, that even such things a student behavior 14 should be covered by the inclusion in the campus plan 15 document of a code of student conduct, that the very standard we're talking about now, compliance with 16 conditions of an order, should be struck. 17 18 This is fundamental to the way in which 19 this regimen has worked and I literally can -- they 20 could not understand why there was a control on the 21 Performing Arts Center. As I say, the desire was to 22 keep rock concerts from being held on campus. 23 could not understand what a revenue generating event 24 was. 25 COMMISSIONER HILDEBRAND: I think you've

1 answered my questioned. Thank you very much. CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Anybody else? 2 Ms. Horne, any questions on cross examination? MS. HORNE: No questions. Thank you. CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. Thank you, Mrs. Zartman. 6 Anyone else who would like to testify in opposition? 9 (No audible response.) 10 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. Did you want 11 to close out with anything? 12 MS. HORNE: Yes. We would just like to note that the ANC has indicated that it 13 14 enthusiastically supports this addition and we have 15 received concept approval from the Commission of Fine Arts. This addition satisfies Section 210 and it will 16 have very little effect on the community. 17 18 We think that by waiting until the BZA remand order is issued the Citizens Association of 19 20 Georgetown's procedural concerns can be addressed that 21 way. The CyberKnife will comply with that order. 22 And also, because this application 23 involves the hospital's ability to provide lifesaving 24 treatment to cancer patients, we would request that 25 the Commission decide this application tonight.

\_

′

However, if the Commission feels that that is not appropriate, we would like to request the Commission expedite its consideration of this case.

And thank you very much.

I opened up with the fact that we've been advised, as you asserted, that there is no campus plan in place and without a campus plan in place, we can't decide this case. So we are going to have to wait for the order. I would just encourage you to try and get the BZA to expedite the issuance of the order and we will take this up as soon as we can after the order is final. And I guess that's the most I can promise you.

We have hearings almost every Monday and Thursday in May, so we can have a special public meeting to take it up when it's timely. And we only have a single vote since this is under BZA rules, so that will help to expedite things as well.

So as I said, I think it's likely that we'll take this up at a special public meeting. So if anyone's interested in finding out when that is and following the case, please contact Mrs. Schellin in the Office of Zoning and then we'll look forward to making a decision on this and I thank you all for your time this evening.